

18. (AMENDED) Anchor according to claim 17, the shank being connected to the fluke with at least a front and rear [two] hinge connections spaced in the direction of the longitudinal axis, at least the rear hinge connection being constructed as said [the aforementioned] coupling.
19. (AMENDED) Anchor according to claim 18, the lever mechanism extending from the rear hinge connection along the shank to [the] an upper end thereof and being connected there for co-rotation with a shackle for an installation line.
24. (AMENDED) Anchor according to claim 23, the operation means comprising a lever mechanism, pivotably arranged on the shank and the first coupling member having a [portion, such as a wedge,] wedge confining the second coupling member being in contact with the lever mechanism in order to be displaced thereby with respect to the second coupling member for its releasing.

Remarks

Claims 1-31 and 33-36 are pending in the application. In this amendment, claims 7-9, 13-15, 18, 19, and 24 have been amended to overcome deficiencies identified by the Examiner in his rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. None of the amendments presented herein are being offered to overcome a prior art rejection. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 20, 21, 23, 25-30, and 33-36 is noted and appreciated. Additionally, the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7-10, 13-16, 22, and 24 is noted and appreciated. The Examiner has rejected claims 7-19, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, identifying a number of antecedent basis issues. Applicants have amended claims 7-9, 13-15, 18, 19 and 24 to correct at least some of these perceived deficiencies. However, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to claims 14, 15, 16, 19, and 22. That is, claim 14 properly references "the longitudinal axis" that is recited in claim 1 at line 1. Similarly, claim 16 now properly references the "rear hinge connection" now explicitly recited in claim 14. Likewise claim 16 also properly references "the operation means" recited in claim 1. Finally, claim 19 properly refers to "the lever mechanism" recited in claim 17.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 11, 12, 17-19 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the Examiner identifies five deficiencies, which are identified by the letters a-e in the official action. Applicant respectfully traverses the objections, and requests reconsideration of the claims. For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant addresses the rejections set forth in paragraphs a-e in like identified paragraphs a-e below.

- a. Urging means is depicted in the figures and described in the specification. For example, urging means may include cams 17 and 19 that form a fulcrum 20 (Figures 2A-F and page 9, line 16), and the mechanism described on page 11, first paragraph and shown in Figures 3A-D.

- b. At page 12, lines 3-5, the specification clearly states that “the slot 70 runs according to a curve which is concentric to the central axis of the pin.” The drawings appear to conform to this written description.
- c. The arrangement of the second pin is described in the specification at page 6, lines 28-30. The described alternative embodiment, however, is not shown in the drawings. Since the arrangement is described in the specification, Applicant believes that the alternative embodiment may be shown in the drawings without the addition of new matter. Applicant will promptly provide a sketch of the new, proposed drawing for the Examiner’s consideration and approval in a supplemental response.
- d. The lever mechanism referenced in claims 17-19 is shown in Figure 8. The lever mechanism may be comprised of a lever arm 307, pin 308, and rod 309.
- e. The resistance is described in the specification in claim 31, but is not shown in the drawings. Since the resistance is described in the specification, Applicant believes that the resistance may be shown in the drawings without the addition of new matter. Applicant will promptly provide a sketch of the new, proposed drawing for the Examiner’s consideration and approval in a supplemental response.

In view of the arguments and amendments presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that all of the pending claims be allowed, and that the case be permitted to issue as a

U.S. Patent. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (713) 934-4050 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,


Terry D. Morgan
Reg. No. 31,181

Attorney for Applicant

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
7676 Hillmont, Suite 250
Houston, Texas 77040
(713) 934-7000

Date: June 21, 2001